

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the found discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6-12, 14-22 and 25-39 are pending in the present application. Claims 4, 5, 13, 23, 24 and 40-43 have been cancelled, and claims 1, 6, 7, 9-12, 14, 21 and 25-32 have been amended by the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 40 was subjected to; claims 40-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; claims 1, 2, 4, 13-15, 19-23, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hung-Yi in view of Lee; claims 3 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hung-Yi in view of Lee and Flannery; claims 5-12, 24-31 and 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hung-Yi in view of Lee and Kirkland; claims 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hung-Yi in view of Lee and Bi et al.

Claim Objections

Regarding the objection to the claim 40, subject matter similar to that recited in claim 40 has been added into claim 1. Further, subject matter added into claim 1 has been amended to address the objection to claim 40. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Regarding the rejection of claims 40-43, independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to include the subject matter recited in dependent claims 40-41 and 42-43, respectfully. Further, subject matter added into independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to address the rejection of claims 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, subject matter has been amended to correspond with the language used in the Specification at paragraph [0026], for example. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 13-15, 19-23, 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hung-Yi in view of Lee. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to include subject matter from that recited in dependent claims 40-41 and 42-43. For example, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the method of providing an advanced screen saver warning for a display apparatus includes controlling, during the continuous execution of the advance screen saver warning, the display apparatus to output at least one of a specified sound and a visual warning message window indicative of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time, wherein the at least one of the specified sound and the visual warning message window is initiated based on the counting of said current system idle time and is deactivated by detection of system activity. Independent claim 21 includes similar features in a varying scope.

These features are supported at least by paragraph [0026] and Figure 5. For example, Figures 5A-5F illustrate outputting a visual warning message window indicative of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advanced screen saver warning time. Further, specified sound may also be used as indicated in paragraph [0026]. In addition, one of the specified sound and the visual warning message window is initiated based on the counting of the current system idle time and is deactivated by the detection of system activity.

Thus, the present invention is directed to control the display apparatus before activation of the screen saver program. That is, the advance screen saver warning time warns a user about an upcoming activation of the screen saver when there is this specified period of system input in activity. Further, the user does not have to go through the laborious operation of reentering password information, etcetera to re-log into the computer when the screen saver is activated. Further, as shown in Figure 5, the user is informed of an amount of time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advanced screen saver warning time so that he or she can determine when the screen saver is going to be activated. However, as discussed in the previously filed response, Hung-Yi warns the user about an upcoming termination of the users computer usage when the time-limit for the usage is about to expire. However, in Hung-Yi, there is no specified

sound or visual warning message window indicative of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advanced screen saver warning time as in the present invention.

Further, Lee is directed to a conventional hibernate mode of a laptop computer. That is, in Lee, this screen saver is displayed, computer system goes into a power shutdown mode to reserve power consumption. Thus, combining Lee with Hung-Yi merely results in the system in Hung-Yi entering into a power saving mode after the screen saver has been displayed for a predetermined amount of time. Combination of Hung-Yi and Lee do not teach or suggest the advanced screen saver warning of the present invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1 and 21 and each claims depending there from are allowable.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the other rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have also been overcome as the claims rejected therein are dependent claims and the additional applied references also do not teach or suggest the features recited in the correspondent independent claims.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone David A. Bilodeau., Registration No. 42,325, at (703) 205-8072, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant